

UNCLASSIFIED

AD NUMBER

AD411164

LIMITATION CHANGES

TO:

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

FROM:

Distribution authorized to U.S. Gov't. agencies and their contractors;  
Administrative/Operational Use; JUN 1963. Other requests shall be referred to Office of Naval Research, Arlington, VA 22203.

AUTHORITY

ONR ltr dtd 4 May 1977

THIS PAGE IS UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

AD 411164

DEFENSE DOCUMENTATION CENTER

FOR

SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION

CAMERON STATION, ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA



UNCLASSIFIED

**BEST  
AVAILABLE COPY**

NOTICE: When government or other drawings, specifications or other data are used for any purpose other than in connection with a definitely related government procurement operation, the U. S. Government thereby incurs no responsibility, nor any obligation whatsoever; and the fact that the Government may have formulated, furnished, or in any way supplied the said drawings, specifications, or other data is not to be regarded by implication or otherwise as in any manner licensing the holder or any other person or corporation, or conveying any rights or permission to manufacture, use or sell any patented invention that may in any way be related thereto.

5853 100

1 steel



**TYCO LABORATORIES, INC.**

BEAR HILL, WALTHAM 54, MASSACHUSETTS  
AREA CODE 617  
TELEPHONE: 899-1650

411164

AD No. \_\_\_\_\_  
DDC FILE COPY

411164

21

ELECTROCHEMISTRY OF FUEL CELL ELECTRODES.

4

Kinetics of the Fe<sup>+++</sup>/Fe<sup>++</sup> Reaction on Fe-Cr Alloys

by

A. C. Makrides

11NA  
6NA  
3NA  
3[28]p  
13NA  
16NA  
12NA  
10W

14 Technical Memorandum No. 4

15 Contract No. Nonr-3765(00)

dated April 16, 1962  
expiring April 15, 1963

16 ARPA Order No. 302-62  
Project Code 9800

17 Task No. NR 359-443

June, 1963

prepared for:

OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH  
Materials Sciences Division  
Washington 25, D. C.

DDC  
AUG 5 1963  
TISIA A

NO OTS

## ABSTRACT

↘ The electrode kinetics of the  $\text{Fe}^{(+++)} / \text{Fe}^{(++)}$  couple on passive Fe-Cr alloys were studied in acid solutions of constant ionic strength ( $\text{M MgSO}_4$ ). Tafel behavior is generally observed with exchange currents of the order of  $10^{-6}$  amp/cm<sup>2</sup> ( $C_{\text{Fe}^{+++}} = C_{\text{Fe}^{++}} = 0.050\text{M}$ ), a cathodic transfer coefficient of 0.40, and an anodic transfer coefficient of 0.36. The electrochemical reaction order is unity both for oxidation of  $\text{Fe}^{(++)}$  and reduction of  $\text{Fe}^{(+++)}$ ; the heat of activation at the reversible potential is 10.8 kcal/mol.

The results show that an appreciable fraction (<sup>about</sup> 0.4) of the total potential drop on anodic polarization occurs within the passive film. This potential drop is probably associated with changes in the average oxidation state of cations between the inner and outer layers of the surface oxide. The electrochemical characteristics of the film depend on the pH of the solution, probably because of the migration of protons into the passive film. A change in the kinetics of  $\text{Fe}^{(++)}$  oxidation which occurs in the transpassive region for the Fe-Cr alloy is probably due to the production of  $\text{Fe}^{+3}$  or  $\text{Cr}^{+6}$  ions in the inner oxide layer. ↗

\* 10 to the -6th power

## I. INTRODUCTION

The kinetics of the  $\text{Fe}^{+++}/\text{Fe}^{++}$  couple on superficially oxidized electrodes present a number of interesting features<sup>(1-4)</sup>. In general, the exchange currents are low ( $\sim 10^{-6}$  a/cm<sup>2</sup>), the transfer coefficients have unusual values and sums less than unity, and the anodic and cathodic curves are generally asymmetrical<sup>(1-4)</sup>. These features appear to be basic to an electrode covered with a thin oxide (i. e. , a passive electrode) and not to be related to the specific nature of the redox couple. They are probably connected with electronic processes within the surface oxide and are expected, therefore, to occur with any redox reaction taking place at such an electrode<sup>(4)</sup>. In particular, they undoubtedly play a major role in oxygen evolution and reduction on electrodes which form surface oxides in the relevant potential region.

A study of the kinetics of the  $\text{Fe}^{+++}/\text{Fe}^{++}$  reaction on passive Fe, Ni, and Ti electrodes was presented in a previous communication<sup>(4)</sup>. This redox couple was chosen as a model reaction because its kinetics are straight-forward on oxide-free electrodes<sup>(5, 6)</sup> and because both oxidation of  $\text{Fe}^{++}$  and reduction of  $\text{Fe}^{+++}$  can be followed over a relatively wide potential range.

A detailed study of the redox kinetics of the  $\text{Fe}^{+++}/\text{Fe}^{++}$  reaction on Fe-Cr alloys is presented here. These alloy electrodes, which show the same general features as other superficially oxidized electrodes, are convenient experimentally since they have small dissolution rates in acid solutions. In addition to the usual experimental quantities required for a more or less complete characterization of a redox reaction (Tafel parameters, reaction order, pH dependence, and temperature coefficient), the dependence of the kinetics on the electrochemical conditioning of the surface film (e. g. , "deforming") was also determined.

## II. EXPERIMENTAL

The electrolytic cell, measuring circuits, and experimental procedure were described previously<sup>(4, 7)</sup>. Galvanostic measurements were generally employed. Under all experimental conditions, the diffusion-limited

current for either  $\text{Fe}^{++}$  or  $\text{Fe}^{+++}$  was at least one order of magnitude greater than the applied current<sup>(4)</sup>. Constant potential measurements were carried out with an electronic potentiostat similar to the one described by Gerischer and Staubach<sup>(8)</sup>.

Fe-Cr alloys, prepared from electrolytic iron and electrolytic chromium, had as the main constituents 13.17% Cr, 0.008% C, 0.011% S, and the balance Fe. A limited amount of work was also done with a commercially available alloy (12.4 Cr, 0.44 Mn, 0.24 Ni and 0.12 % Cu).

The solution was M in  $\text{MgSO}_4$ . The large excess of bivalent, inert electrolyte insured a constant composition of the electrolytic double layer even at the highest concentration of  $\text{Fe}^{+++}$  and  $\text{Fe}^{++}$  ions. Reagents were of C. P. grade.

In general, potentials were measured both against a platinized Pt electrode in the same solution with the working electrode and a SCE electrode. Platinized Pt was reversible to  $\text{Fe}^{+++}/\text{Fe}^{++}$  as shown by its response to  $(\text{Fe}^{++})$  or  $(\text{Fe}^{+++})$  at fixed ionic strength (see, for example, Fig. 1) and its behavior upon polarization at a few  $\mu\text{a}$  in either direction. The reversible potential of the  $\text{Fe}^{+++}/\text{Fe}^{++}$  couple is pH-dependent because of equilibria involving  $\text{Fe}(\text{OH})^{++}$  and possibly  $\text{Fe}(\text{OH})^+$ <sup>(9)</sup>. The pH dependence of a platinized Pt electrode at a fixed  $(\text{Fe}^{+++})/(\text{Fe}^{++})$  and fixed ionic strength (M  $\text{MgSO}_4$ ) is shown in Fig. 2. The potentials in Figs. 1 and 2 include an appreciable liquid junction potential, which is, however, constant and independent of the  $(\text{Fe}^{+++})$  and  $(\text{Fe}^{++})$  concentrations and of the pH.

The concentrations of  $(\text{Fe}^{++})$  and  $(\text{Fe}^{+++})$  were determined by titration with  $\text{K}_2\text{Cr}_2\text{O}_7$  in the standard way using diphenyl amine sodium sulfonate as the end-point indicator.

### III. RESULTS

#### Reproducibility

Tafel curves were obtained for the  $\text{Fe}^{+++}/\text{Fe}^{++}$  reaction on Fe-Cr electrodes as was the case with passive Fe, Ni, and Ti electrodes<sup>(4)</sup>. Typical polarization curves for Fe-Cr are shown in Fig. 3. The anodic polarization curve was not semilogarithmic under certain conditions, but showed a more

complicated behavior described in detail below.

In general, the potential assumed a steady value within a short time after the current was set to a new value. Overshoot or undershoot, depending on whether the current was increasing or decreasing, was observed in certain potential ranges. These cases are discussed below.

The reproducibility of current-potential curves obtained with a given electrode over extended periods ( $\sim 100$  hrs.) is illustrated in Table I. The initial slow change, which comes to an end after about 24 hrs., is probably due to a change in the film. The rest-potential, which is originally about -20 mv vs. the reversible  $\text{Fe}^{+++}/\text{Fe}^{++}$  potential, slowly changes towards zero indicating a continuously diminishing contribution from corrosion reactions. The rest potential is within 3-5 mv of the reversible potential after about 24 hrs. in almost all of the solutions used here. In general, the electrodes were extremely stable after the first 24 hrs. and showed little susceptibility to poisoning. This is probably due in part to the smaller tendency of oxide-covered surfaces, as compared to oxide-free surfaces, for adsorbing impurities and in part to the relatively high, positive electrode potential.

#### Reaction Orders

Current-potential curves in a solution of constant pH and M in  $\text{MgSO}_4$  were determined for ( $\text{Fe}^{++}$ ) and ( $\text{Fe}^{+++}$ ) concentrations between 0.01 and 0.06 M. The currents at a fixed anodic (0.60 V vs. SCE) and fixed cathodic (0.20V vs. SCE) potentials are shown in Fig. 4. Both electrochemical reaction orders

$$\left( \frac{\partial \log i_a}{\partial \log(\text{Fe}^{++})} \right)_{E_a} = 1 = \left( \frac{\partial \log i_c}{\partial \log(\text{Fe}^{+++})} \right)_{E_c} \quad (1)$$

are equal to unity in solutions containing a large excess of inert electrolyte (M  $\text{MgSO}_4$ ).

#### Temperature Coefficient

The temperature dependence of  $i_0$ , determined by extrapolation of

Table I

Oxidation of Fe<sup>++</sup> (\*)

<u>t (hrs)</u>	<u>i<sub>o</sub> (amp/cm<sup>2</sup>)</u>	<u>b (v)</u>	<u>Rest Potential</u>
2	5.0 x 10 <sup>-7</sup>	0.190	-0.022
24	3.8 x 10 <sup>-7</sup>	0.161	-0.006
80	3.8 x 10 <sup>-7</sup>	0.159	-0.001
120	4.0 x 10 <sup>-7</sup>	0.156	-0.0005

---

(\*) C<sub>Fe<sup>++</sup></sub> = C<sub>Fe<sup>+++</sup></sub> = 0.050 M; M MgSO<sub>4</sub>; pH = 0.30

of the cathodic Tafel line, in solutions of pH = 1.50 and 0.30 is shown in Fig. 5. The energy of activation is essentially independent of pH and is  $\Delta H^* = 10.8$  kcal/mol.

### Corrosion Reactions

The rest potential is negative to the  $\text{Fe}^{+++}/\text{Fe}^{++}$  reversible potential in solutions of low pH and low in  $(\text{Fe}^{+++})$  or  $(\text{Fe}^{++})$  indicating that the corrosion current is significant in comparison to  $i_0$ . In these cases, the polarization curves were corrected for the steady-state corrosion current by assuming that the latter was independent of the potential as it is known to be from potentiostatic measurements in the absence of the redox couple. The corrosion current was obtained from the anodic current required to polarize the electrode from its rest potential to the  $\text{Fe}^{+++}/\text{Fe}^{++}$  reversible potential. The curves were then corrected by subtracting this quantity from the anodic applied current and adding it to the cathodic applied current as shown in Fig. 6 for the commercial Fe-Cr alloy. The assumption of constancy of  $i_{\text{corr}}$  was checked by comparing  $i_{\text{corr}}$  determined as described above with the value calculated from the difference between the corrected cathodic curve and the corrected anodic curve extrapolated to the rest potential. Table II shows that values of  $i_{\text{corr}}$  obtained in these two ways agree closely.

### pH Dependence

The exchange current and the Tafel slopes decrease with decreasing pH as shown in Fig. 7. The exchange current at pH = 1.35 is less than that at pH = 2.2 by a factor of about 3. This decrease is probably connected with changes in the concentration of ionic species in solution (e. g.  $\text{Fe}(\text{H}_2\text{O})^{+++}$ ,  $\text{Fe}(\text{OH})^{++}$ ,  $\text{Fe}(\text{OH})^+$ , etc.) which are also responsible for the change of the reversible potential with pH.

At pH of 1.5 or less, a qualitative change in the anodic polarization curve can be induced by a brief cathodic pulse or may appear spontaneously after the electrode has been in solution for some time. This is described in detail below.

Table II

Corrosion Currents of Commercial Fe-Cr Alloy  
 N H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> at 30°C

$\text{Fe}^{++}$	$\text{Fe}^{+++}$	$E_{\text{corr}}$	$i_{\text{corr}}^{(1)}$	$(i_c - i_a) \text{ at } E_{\text{corr}}^{(2)}$
(M/l)	(M/l)	(V)	(a/cm <sup>2</sup> )	(a/cm <sup>2</sup> )
$1.09 \times 10^{-3}$	$1.38 \times 10^{-2}$	-0.026	$4.0 \times 10^{-7}$	$3.3 \times 10^{-7}$
$1.09 \times 10^{-3}$	$2.83 \times 10^{-2}$	-0.025	$4.2 \times 10^{-7}$	$3.6 \times 10^{-7}$
$1.09 \times 10^{-3}$	$4.92 \times 10^{-2}$	-0.020	$4.0 \times 10^{-7}$	$3.2 \times 10^{-7}$
$1.09 \times 10^{-3}$	$6.94 \times 10^{-2}$	-0.018	$5.0 \times 10^{-7}$	$4.6 \times 10^{-7}$
$2.07 \times 10^{-3}$	$6.94 \times 10^{-2}$	-0.014	$4.5 \times 10^{-7}$	$4.0 \times 10^{-7}$
$4.05 \times 10^{-3}$	$6.94 \times 10^{-2}$	-0.013	$3.0 \times 10^{-7}$	$3.5 \times 10^{-7}$
$5.90 \times 10^{-3}$	$6.94 \times 10^{-2}$	-0.010	$4.3 \times 10^{-7}$	$3.0 \times 10^{-7}$

---

(1) Applied anodic current for  $\eta = 0$

(2) From extrapolated polarization curves after corrections for  $i_{\text{corr}}$ .

### "Forming" and "Deforming" of the Surface Film

It was observed that in solutions of low pH, the anodic and cathodic curves did not extrapolate to a common  $i_0$  although the rest potential coincided with the reversible  $\text{Fe}^{+++}/\text{Fe}^{++}$  potential. In particular, the anodic curve appeared to consist of two Tafel lines, the lower one extrapolating to about the same  $i_0$  as the cathodic curve. This change from a single anodic Tafel line to the type of curve shown in Fig. 8 was delayed or was even absent if the film was formed in a solution of high pH and the pH was later adjusted to a lower value. Also, it proved possible to induce this change by a brief cathodic pulse and to reverse it by an anodic pulse. These phenomena are obviously related to changes in the composition or structure of the surface film. The term "deforming" is used here to denote the change produced by a cathodic pulse while "forming" refers to the change induced by an anodic pulse.

Polarization curves obtained with electrodes pulsed anodically or cathodically are shown in Fig. 8. The effect of a cathodic pulse on the cathodic polarization curve is slight. An anodic pulse displaces the cathodic curve in the direction of higher overpotentials, but the effect is relatively small. However, at overpotentials more negative than about -150 mv, the electrode potential at a fixed current density increases rapidly with time, a phenomenon not observed with electrodes which had not been pulsed.

The kinetics of oxidation of  $\text{Fe}^{++}$  are changed substantially both by cathodic and by anodic pulses. The anodic curve after "deforming" is no longer semilogarithmic but is approximately by two Tafel lines with a fairly sharp transition (Fig. 9). The cathodic pulse does not increase the corrosion rate since the reversible potential and the rest potential after deforming are still the same. Furthermore, the effects of a cathodic pulse are not transitory. Anodic curves obtained shortly after a cathodic pulse are the same as those obtained 100 hrs. later. The curves shown in Figs. 8 and 9 were obtained 24 hrs. after the pulse was applied.

Anodic pulses displace the anodic curve towards higher overpotentials and increase the Tafel slope to relatively high values. The effects of anodic or cathodic pulses are essentially independent of the previous history of the electrode, i. e., of the order in which the electrode was pulsed.

### Transpassive Region

The potential was always kept within the passive region for the Fe-Cr alloy in the measurements described above. At high anodic potentials the alloy begins to dissolve again at a steady rate which depends on the potential. The onset of anodic dissolution in the transpassive region has a pronounced effect on the kinetics of oxidation of  $\text{Fe}^{++}$ . First, there is an overshoot of the potential on increasing the current and an undershoot when the current is decreased. Second, the Tafel slope for  $\text{Fe}^{++}$  oxidation decreases substantially in the transpassive region of the alloy (Fig. 10). It might appear at first that the increase in total current is due to the additional anodic current corresponding to metal oxidation. However, measurements of the anodic polarization curve in the absence of the redox couple show that the metal oxidation current is entirely negligible (Fig. 11). For example, at  $E = 0.850$  vs. SCE ( $\eta = 0.425$  V) the total current is  $400 \mu\text{a}/\text{cm}^2$ , and the metal oxidation current is only  $1.5 \mu\text{a}/\text{cm}^2$ .

### IV. DISCUSSION

The low exchange currents and the unusual values of the Tafel slopes (see Table III) are characteristic features of redox reactions on superficially oxidized electrodes. In general, the sum of the apparent transfer coefficients on passive electrodes is less than unit. For example, Table III shows that  $\alpha_a + \alpha_c = 0.76 \pm 0.03$  on Fe-Cr alloys; similar results were reported for other passive electrodes (1, 4). The parameters are in contrast to those obtained on oxide-free electrodes. For example, the exchange current on Pt electrodes with  $C_{\text{Fe}^{+++}} = C_{\text{Fe}^{++}} = 0.05\text{M}$  is  $1.5 \times 10^{-2} \text{A}/\text{cm}^2$  and the transfer coefficients are  $\alpha_a = 0.58 \pm 0.02$  for the anodic and  $\alpha_c = 0.42 \pm 0.02$  for the cathodic reaction (5, 6). The main difference in the kinetics (aside from difference of the exchange current) is in the apparent transfer coefficient for the anodic reaction. The cathodic transfer coefficients on passive Fe-Cr and on passive Ni and Ti (4) are all about the same as on Pt(\*). The result  $\alpha_a + \alpha_c < 1.0$  on passive electrodes is due to the smaller value of  $\alpha_a$  on these electrodes and indicates that the anodic reaction is not a simple electrochemical process as it is on Pt.

---

(\*) A cathodic transfer coefficient of 0.69 is observed for  $\text{Fe}^{+++}$  reduction on passive Fe(4). However, in this case the ionic current on cathodic polarization is probably a large fraction of the total current.

Table III

Fe<sup>+++</sup> / Fe<sup>++</sup> on Passive Fe-Cr  
T = 30.0°C

$\frac{\text{Fe}^{+++}}{\text{(M/ )}}$	$\frac{\text{Fe}^{++}}{\text{(M/ )}}$	$\text{pH}^{(1)}$	$\alpha_c$	$\alpha_a$
$5.0 \times 10^{-3}$	$5.0 \times 10^{-3}$	0.30	0.40	0.37
$5.0 \times 10^{-2}$	$5.0 \times 10^{-2}$	0.30	0.38	0.37
$1.0 \times 10^{-1}$	$1.0 \times 10^{-1}$	1.35	0.43	0.36
$5.0 \times 10^{-2}$	$5.0 \times 10^{-2}$	1.5	0.40	0.35
$1.0 \times 10^{-1}$	$1.0 \times 10^{-1}$	1.7	0.41	0.35
$1.0 \times 10^{-1}$	$1.0 \times 10^{-1}$	2.1	0.38	0.30
$1.4 \times 10^{-2}$	$5.0 \times 10^{-3}$	0.60 <sup>(2)</sup>	0.42	0.38
$4.1 \times 10^{-2}$	$5.0 \times 10^{-3}$	0.60 <sup>(2)</sup>	0.40	0.38
$5.0 \times 10^{-2}$	$5.0 \times 10^{-2}$	0.30	0.40	0.58 <sup>(3)</sup>
				0.37
$5.0 \times 10^{-2}$	$5.0 \times 10^{-2}$	1.35	0.42	0.58 <sup>(3)</sup>

$$\text{Avg. } \alpha_c = 0.40 \pm 0.01$$

$$\alpha_a = 0.36 \pm 0.02$$

---

(1) All solutions M in MgSO<sub>4</sub> except where noted.

(2) No MgSO<sub>4</sub> added

(3) Two Tafel slopes on anodic polarization; data not included in average  $\alpha_c$  or  $\alpha_a$ .

It should be pointed out that in other respects the electrode behavior of passive metals towards the  $\text{Fe}^{+++}/\text{Fe}^{++}$  couple is similar to that of an inert electrode. Thus, the rest potential generally coincides with the reversible  $\text{Fe}^{+++}/\text{Fe}^{++}$  potential, a result which implies that the surface oxide film has a reasonable electronic conductivity. Also, passive electrodes respond to changes in the concentration of either ( $\text{Fe}^{++}$ ) or ( $\text{Fe}^{+++}$ ) in the simple way expected for a first order, one-electron reaction without the complications usually associated with specific adsorption of either ion. Thus, the electrochemical reaction order is unity provided sufficient excess of inert electrolyte is present to suppress effects arising from the diffuse part of the double layer. In less concentrated salt solutions, the composition of the double layer is not independent of the ( $\text{Fe}^{+++}$ ) or ( $\text{Fe}^{++}$ ) concentration and the kinetics are more complicated.

#### Ionic and Electronic Currents

The anodic reaction on passive electrodes involves probably both oxidation of the metal and oxidation of  $\text{Fe}^{++}$ . Therefore, the total applied current is the sum of an ionic current corresponding to the formation or reduction of the surface film, and of an electronic current equivalent to the rate at which the redox reaction is taking place. When no external current is applied, the anodic ionic current is equal to the net reduction current of  $\text{Fe}^{+++}$  at the resting potential. If the ionic current is appreciable, the rest potential is negative to the reversible potential (a mixed potential). If, however, the ionic current is negligible in comparison to the exchange current for the  $\text{Fe}^{+++}/\text{Fe}^{++}$  couple, the reversible and rest potentials coincide and the alloy functions essentially as an inert, indicator electrode.

The kinetics of film growth may be involved in determining the polarization curves either directly through the contribution of the ionic current to the total current, or indirectly through the possible effect of changes of film thickness and composition on the distribution of the total potential drop between the film and the electrolytic double layer. The commonly accepted account of the kinetics of growth of passive films is due to Vetter(10) who assumed that the rate-determining step is the field-assisted migration of cations through the oxide. In the steady state, film growth is balanced by

film dissolution which occurs by a purely chemical reaction. If the potential is raised to a more positive value, the film thickens until the field across it is reduced to its prior value; the rate of growth is then again equal to the dissolution rate. This mechanism accounts for the most notable characteristic of passive electrodes, namely a steady-state, oxidation current which is independent of potential. The most important aspects of this mechanism which bear on the present studies are the constant dissolution rate and the exponential dependence of the rate of film growth on the field across the oxide.

Consider a passive Fe-Cr electrode in a solution 0.05M in  $\text{Fe}^{+++}$  and  $\text{Fe}^{++}$  ions in  $\text{MgSO}_4$ , and of pH = 1.5. The steady state dissolution rate of the alloy is less than  $10^{-7}$  a/cm<sup>2</sup>, which is negligible in comparison to the exchange current. The distribution of potential from metal to electrolyte at the reversible  $\text{Fe}^{+++}/\text{Fe}^{++}$  potential may be described by

$$E_{\text{rev}} = V + E_{d\phi} = \text{Constant} \quad (2)$$

where  $V$  is within the oxide, and  $E_{d\phi}$  is a potential drop across the oxide/electrolyte interface. If the electrode is polarized anodically, say to a potential  $E$ , an ionic and an electronic current flow across the film. The former corresponds to the rate of growth of the oxide and the latter to the rate of oxidation of  $\text{Fe}^{++}$ . As the film thickens, the ionic current eventually decreases to its previous value, i.e.,  $10^{-7}$  --  $10^{-8}$  a/cm<sup>2</sup>. The electronic current depends on the kinetics of ferrous oxidation and is given by

$$i_a = i_0 \exp(\beta r \eta_{d\phi}) \quad (3)$$

where  $\eta_{d\phi}$  is in units of  $RT/F$ , and  $\alpha_r$  is the transfer coefficient for  $\text{Fe}^{++}$  oxidation.

The results show that in all cases studied (see also ref. 4) an appreciable fraction of the applied potential on anodic polarization is across the film. This implies that the transfer of electrons from the oxide/solution interface to the metal -- or of holes in the opposite direction -- occurs over a potential barrier. If it is assumed that the potential drop across the film is

a constant fraction, say  $\gamma$ , of the total applied potential, and since

$$\eta = E - E_{\text{rev}} = \Delta V + \eta_{\text{dl}} = \gamma\eta + \eta_{\text{dl}} \quad (4)$$

then the fraction of the overpotential across the double layer is

$$\eta_{\text{dl}} = (1 - \gamma)\eta \quad (5)$$

Substituting in Eq. (3) we have for the anodic current

$$i_a = i_o \exp \left[ \beta_r (1 - \gamma)\eta \right] \quad (6)$$

On the other hand, the transfer of electrons from metal to the oxide/solution interface is apparently accompanied by a negligible change in the total potential drop across the film, and consequently

$$i_c = i_o \exp(-\alpha_r \eta_{\text{dl}}) = i_o \exp(-\alpha_r \eta) \quad (7)$$

where  $\alpha_r$  is the transfer coefficient for  $\text{Fe}^{+++}$  reduction ( $\alpha_r + \beta_r = 1$ ).

The sum of the apparent transfer coefficients is

$$\alpha_a + \alpha_c = (1 - \gamma)\beta_r + \alpha_r = 1 - \gamma\beta_r \quad (8)$$

so that in the particular case of Fe-Cr alloys ( $\alpha_a + \alpha_c = 0.76$ )  $\gamma$  is 0.4.

An alternative interpretation of the unusual transfer coefficients may be considered. If it is assumed that the transfer of electrons across the film gives rise to a potential drop,  $V_f$ , according to the dual barrier model proposed for redox reactions on valve metals, e.g. Zr (11), then the anodic current across the film may be expressed by

$$i_a = i_{o,f} \exp(\alpha_f V_f) \quad (9)$$

where the subscript  $f$  refers to the film. The current across the double layer is, of course, the same and is given by Eq. (8), while the total potential drop from metal to solution is again  $\eta = V_f + \eta_{dl}$ . Although the polarization curve defined by Eqs. (8) and (9) is not semilogarithmic, it may be approximated by a Tafel curve over a narrow range of current densities (11). It is difficult to decide on the basis of the polarization characteristics alone (the range of accessible current densities being relatively small) whether the dual-barrier model or the one advance above is applicable. However, the electrochemical reaction orders can be used to differentiate between these two alternative interpretations. According to the dual-barrier model, the reaction order is

$$\left( \frac{\partial \ln i}{\partial \ln C} \right)_E = \frac{\alpha_f}{\alpha_f + \beta_r} \quad (10)$$

On the other hand, the account given above requires that

$$\left( \frac{\partial \ln i}{\partial \ln C} \right)_E = 1 \quad (11)$$

since  $V$ , and consequently  $\eta_{dl}$ , are constant at constant  $E$ . The experimental results agree with Eq. (11) and show that the transfer of electrons across the film is not described by Eq.(9).

It should be noted that the postulated potential drop within the oxide film does not appear in the expression for the electrode potential when the  $Fe^{+++}/Fe^{++}$  is at equilibrium. The argument here parallels the analysis which shows that the thermodynamic potential of any redox couple is independent of the actual potential drop across the solid/electrolyte interface of an inert, indicator electrode. Similarly, the experimental results on anodic polarization do not refer to the absolute magnitude of potential drop within the oxide, but rather to changes of this potential.

The electronic properties of the surface oxide which give rise to the observed behavior may be described in terms of the continuum properties of

semiconducting oxides, e. g. , it may be supposed that the oxide next to the solution is of p-type while that next to the metal is of n-type. However, it is doubtful that these terms are relevant since the thickness of the oxide is of the order of 100Å. Therefore, it is preferable to consider charge transfer within the oxide in terms of changes in chemical composition which may occur as the potential is changed to more or less positive values.

Consider, for example, a surface film of iron oxide in which the layers next to the solution are essentially  $\text{Fe}_2\text{O}_3$ , while the layers next to the metal may approach  $\text{FeO}$ . On cathodic polarization, an electron is transferred to a ferric ion in solution and a higher valency ion is left behind. The higher valency ion can accept an electron from a ferrous ion in the film which is in turn oxidized to the +3 state and eventually accepts an electron from the metal. On anodic polarization, an electron is transferred from a ferrous ion in solution to either a ferric ion in the film or to an ion of a higher valence, say  $\text{Fe}^{+4}$ , which may be associated with a cation vacancy. Further charge transfer must occur by transfer of an electron to a ferrous ion in the inner layer or by transfer to a ferric ion which may be produced next to the metal. Since the first alternative is not likely, transfer will depend on the production of ferric ions in the inner layer. This is associated with an overpotential which apparently constitutes an appreciable fraction of the total applied potential difference. A similar analysis is applicable to other oxide films (e. g.  $\text{NiO}$ ) present on passive metals (4). The fraction of the overpotential which appears within the film is large in the case of Ti (0.60) and Fe-Cr (0.40), but is relatively small (0.15) in the case of Ni(4). In the case of Fe and Ti, and under circumstances previously discussed(4), practically all of the potential drop occurs in the oxide. In these cases, a substantial increase of the thickness of the oxide film apparently takes place on anodic polarization.

#### Changes of Film Characteristics

The electrochemical characteristics of the surface oxide are changed either by an anodic or cathodic pulse. Furthermore, they are obviously also different in the transpassive region of the alloy. A change in the anodic polarization curve once a certain overpotential was exceeded was previously reported by Stern (1) who tentatively attributed it to the onset of oxygen

evolution. The present study shows that oxygen evolution cannot be involved since the potential is in all cases less than the reversible oxygen potential.

The change of slope in the transpassive region is probably connected with the introduction into the film of large numbers of ions of higher valence ( $\text{Fe}^{+3}$ ,  $\text{Cr}^{+6}$ ). The potential drop within the oxide in the transpassive region apparently increases much more slowly with the total potential. As long as the metal oxidation current is negligible in comparison to the oxidation of  $\text{Fe}^{++}$ , the total  $i$ - $E$  characteristics should approach that for the anodic oxidation of  $\text{Fe}^{++}$ . In particular, the apparent transfer coefficient should approach 0.60. The observed change in the Tafel slope is in the expected direction.

The effects of anodic and cathodic pulses suggest that the potential drop across the oxide changes after a pulse. Stated differently, these results suggest that the electronic characteristics of the oxide are altered substantially by pulsing. A cathodic pulse apparently decreases the fraction of the potential drop which is across the oxide; an anodic pulse has the opposite effect. The apparent anodic transfer coefficient changes accordingly towards larger or smaller values. The origin of this effect is not clear at present. It may be connected with migration of protons into or out of the film since a change similar to that produced by a cathodic pulse also occurs when the pH is lowered (12). Apparently, proton migration is a slow process since the changes produced by pulsing persist for at least 100 hours after the pulse. This conclusion is supported by the observation that the characteristics of a film formed in a solution of high pH remain the same for some time after the pH is adjusted to a lower value.

## V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

(1) Passive Fe-Cr alloy electrodes function as inert, indicator electrodes for the  $\text{Fe}^{+++}/\text{Fe}^{++}$  couple. The steady-state, ionic current is generally negligible compared with the electron current.

(2) Tafel curves are obtained on both anodic and cathodic polarization. The transfer coefficients are 0.36 for the anodic and 0.40 for the cathodic reaction. The exchange current is of the order of  $10^{-6}$  a/cm<sup>2</sup> for  $C_{\text{Fe}^{+++}}$ .

$= C_{\text{Fe}^{+++}} = 0.05\text{M}$ . The electrochemical reaction orders are unity for both  $\text{Fe}^{++}$  and  $\text{Fe}^{+++}$ . The temperature coefficient of the exchange current is 10.8 kcal/mol.

(3) The polarization characteristics suggest that an appreciable fraction of the total potential drop between electrode and solution is across the surface film. The potential drop across the film increases linearly with the total applied potential. This dependence leads to an apparent transfer coefficient for the anodic reaction which is substantially less than what is expected for the oxidation of  $\text{Fe}^{++}$ .

(4) The electrochemical characteristics of the passive film depend on the pH and can be modified by anodic or cathodic pulses. The film characteristics are also changed significantly when the potential is within the transpassive region for the alloy.

## REFERENCES

- 1 Stern, M. , J. Electrochem. Soc. , 104, 559, 600 (1957)
- 2 Posey, F. A. , J. Electrochem. Soc. , 106, 582 (1959)
- 3 Makrides, A. C. and Stern, M. , J. Electrochem. Soc., 107, 877(1960)
- 4 Makrides, A. C., submit. , J. Electrochem. Soc.
- 5 Gerischer, J. Z. Elektrochem. , 54, 362 (1950)
- 6 Randles, J. E. B. , and Somerton, K. W. , Trans. Faraday Soc. , 48, 937 (1952).
- 7 Makrides, A. C. , J. Electrochem. , 109, 977 (1962)
- 8 Gerischer, H. and Staubach, K. E. , Z. Elektrochem. , 61, 789 (1957)
- 9 Latimer, W. M. , "Oxidation Potentials", Prentice-Hall, 1952, p. 224
- 10 Vetter, K. J. , Z. Elektrochem. , 58, 230 (1954); 59, 67 (1955)
- 11 Meyer, R. E. , J. Electrochem. Soc. , 107, 847 (1960)
- 12 Leach, J. S. L. , J. Inst. Met. 27,(1959)

## FIGURE CAPTIONS

- Fig. 1 The potential of platinized Pt as a function of the ferrous ion concentration at fixed ionic strength (M  $\text{MgSO}_4$ ) and fixed ferric ion concentration and at  $30^\circ\text{C}$ .
- Fig. 2 The potential of platinized Pt at fixed  $C_{\text{Fe}^{+++}}/C_{\text{Fe}^{++}}$  (0.05M) and fixed ionic strength (M  $\text{MgSO}_4$ ) as a function of pH at  $30^\circ\text{C}$ .
- Fig. 3 Polarization curves of the  $\text{Fe}^{+++}/\text{Fe}^{++}$  couple (0.050M) on passive Fe-Cr in M  $\text{MgSO}_4$  at pH = 2.2. The solid circles are calculated from  $i_o = i_c + i_{\text{appl}}$  where  $i_c$  is the extrapolated cathodic current and  $i_{\text{appl}}$  the externally applied current ( $30^\circ\text{C}$ ).
- Fig. 4 The current at a fixed potential as a function of the concentration of ferrous or ferric ions -○- oxidation of  $\text{Fe}^{++}$  at 0.600 V vs. SCE -●- reduction of  $\text{Fe}^{+++}$  at 0.200 V vs. SCE ( $30^\circ\text{C}$ ).
- Fig. 5 The temperature coefficient of the exchange current (extrapolated from the cathodic curve) for  $\text{Fe}^{+++}/\text{Fe}^{++}$  (0.50M) in M  $\text{MgSO}_4$ .
- Fig. 6 Current-potential curves for the  $\text{Fe}^{+++}/\text{Fe}^{++}$  couple (0.05M) on commercial Fe-Cr alloys. The full circles are obtained after correction for the corrosion current ( $30^\circ\text{C}$ ).
- Fig. 7 Polarization curves of the  $\text{Fe}^{+++}/\text{Fe}^{++}$  couple (0.10M) on passive Fe-Cr in M  $\text{MgSO}_4$  at different pH ( $30^\circ\text{C}$ ).
- Fig. 8 The effect of anodic (●) and cathodic (◐) pulsing on the polarization curve of the  $\text{Fe}^{+++}/\text{Fe}^{++}$  couple (0.10M) on passive Fe-Cr in M  $\text{MgSO}_4$  at pH = 1.35. The curve corresponding to -●- was obtained with electrodes which had not been pulsed ( $30^\circ\text{C}$ ).

FIGURE CAPTIONS - continued

- Fig. 9      The anodic polarization curve for  $\text{Fe}^{++}$  oxidation on passive Fe-Cr alloy after cathodic pulsing. Measurements were made 24 hrs. after pulsing.
- Fig. 10     The anodic polarization curve for  $\text{Fe}^{++}$  (0.050M) oxidation in M  $\text{MgSO}_4$  at pH = 0.30. Note the change in slope in the transpassive region ( $\eta > 0.35\text{V}$  or  $E > 0.70\text{ V vs. SCE}$ ) ( $30^\circ\text{C}$ ).
- Fig. 11     The potentiostatic anodic polarization curve of Fe-Cr electrodes in M  $\text{MgSO}_4$  at pH = 0.30 and at  $30^\circ\text{C}$ .




FIG. 1




FIG. 2




FIG. 3




FIG. 4




FIG. 5








FIG. 6












FIG. 11

TECHNICAL REPORT DISTRIBUTION LIST

Contract No. Nonr 3765(00)

Commanding Officer Office of Naval Research Branch Office The John Crerar Library Building 86 East Randolph Street Chicago 1, Illinois (1)	Air Force Office of Scientific Research (SRC-E) Washington 25, D.C. (1)
Commanding Officer Office of Naval Research Branch Office 346 Broadway New York 13, New York (1)	Commanding Officer Diamond Ordnance Fuze Labs. Washington 25, D.C. Attn: Technical Information Office Branch 012 (1)
Commanding Officer Office of Naval Research Branch Office 1030 East Green Street Pasadena 1, California (1)	Office, Chief of Research & Development, Dept. of the Army Washington 25, D.C. Attn: Physical Sciences Div. (1)
Commanding Officer Office of Naval Research Branch Office Box 39 Navy #100 Fleet Post Office New York, New York (7)	Chief, Bureau of Ships Department of the Navy Washington 25, D.C. Attn: Code 342C (2)
Director, Naval Research Laboratory Washington 25, D.C. Attn: Technical Information Officer (6) Chemistry Division (2)	Chief, Bureau of Naval Weapons Department of the Navy Washington 25, D.C. Attn: Technical Library (4)
Chief of Naval Research Department of the Navy Washington 25, D.C. Attn: Code 425 (2)	ASTIA Document Service Center Arlington Hall Station Arlington 12, Virginia (10)
DDR&E Technical Library Room 3C-128, The Pentagon Washington 25, D.C. (1)	Director of Research U. S. Army Signal Research & Development Laboratory Fort Monmouth, New Jersey (1)
Technical Director Research & Engineering Division Office of the Quartermaster General Department of the Army Washington 25, D.C. (1)	Naval Radiological Defense Laboratory San Francisco 24, California Attn: Technical Library (1)
Research Director Clothing & Organic Materials Division Quartermaster Research & Engineering Command, U. S. Army Natick, Massachusetts (1)	Naval Ordnance Test Station China Lake, California Attn: Head, Chemistry Division (1)

<p>Commanding Officer                      Army Research Office                      Box CM, Duke Station                      Durham, North Carolina                      Attn: Scientific Synthesis Office (1)</p>	<p>Inspector of Naval Material                      495 Summer Street                      Boston 10, Massachusetts (1)</p>
<p>Brookhaven National Laboratory                      Chemistry Department                      Upton, New York (1)</p>	<p>Mr. R. A. Osteryoung                      Atomics International                      Canoga Park, California (1)</p>
<p>Atomic Energy Commission                      Division of Research                      Chemistry Programs                      Washington 25, D. C. (1)</p>	<p>Dr. David M. Mason                      Stanford University                      Stanford, California (1)</p>
<p>Atomic Energy Commission                      Division of Technical Information                      Extension                      Post Office Box 62                      Oak Ridge, Tennessee (1)</p>	<p>Dr. Howard L. Recht                      Astropower, Inc.                      2968 Randolph Avenue                      Costa Mesa, California (1)</p>
<p>U. S. Army Chemical Research and                      Development Laboratories                      Technical Library                      Army Chemical Center, Maryland (1)</p>	<p>Mr. L. R. Griffith                      California Research Corporation                      576 Standard Avenue                      Richmond, California (1)</p>
<p>Office of Technical Services                      Department of Commerce                      Washington 25, D. C. (1)</p>	<p>Dr. Ralph G. Gentile                      Monsanto Research Corporation                      Boston Laboratories                      Everett 49, Massachusetts (1)</p>
<p>Commanding Officer                      Office of Naval Research Branch                      Office                      495 Summer Street                      Boston 10, Massachusetts (1)</p>	<p>Dr. Ray M. Hurd                      Texas Research Associates                      1701 Guadalupe Street                      Austin 1, Texas (1)</p>
<p>Director, ARPA                      Attn: Dr. J. H. Huth                      Material Sciences                      Room 3D155 The Pentagon                      Washington 25, D. C. (4)</p>	<p>Dr. C. E. Heath                      Esso Research &amp; Engineering                      Company                      Box 51                      Linden, New Jersey (1)</p>
<p>Dr. S. Schuldmer                      Naval Research Laboratory                      Code 6160                      Washington 25, D. C. (1)</p>	<p>Dr. Richard H. Leet                      American Oil Company                      Whiting Laboratories                      Post Office Box 431                      Whiting, Indiana (1)</p>
<p>Dr. R. F. Baddour                      Department of Chemistry                      Mass. Institute of Technology                      Cambridge 39, Massachusetts (1)</p>	<p>Dr. G. C. Szego                      Institute for Defense Analysis                      1666 Connecticut Avenue N. W.                      Washington 9, D. C. (1)</p>

Dr. Douglas W. McKee General Electric Company Research Laboratories Schenectady, New York	(1)	Dr. T. P. Dirkse Department of Chemistry Calvin College Grand Rapids, Michigan	(1)
Dr. E. A. Oster General Electric Company, DECO Lynn, Massachusetts	(1)	Dr. George J. Janz Department of Chemistry Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute Troy, New York	(1)
Dr. R. R. Heikes Solid State Phenomena Department Westinghouse Electric Corporation Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania		Mr. N. F. Blackburn E. R. D. L. Materials Branch Fort Belvoir, Virginia	(1)
Prof. Herman P. Meissner Massachusetts Institute of Technology Cambridge 39, Massachusetts	(1)	Dr. G. Barth-Wehrenalp, Director Inorganic Research Department Pennsalt Chemicals Corporation Box 4388 Philadelphia 18, Pennsylvania	(2)
Mr. Donald P. Snowden General Atomic Post Office Box 608 San Diego 12, California	(1)	Dr. B. R. Sundheim Department of Chemistry New York University New York 3, New York	(1)
Prof. C. Tobias Chemistry Department University of California Berkeley, California	(1)	Dr. B. R. Stein European Research Office U. S. Army R&D Liaison Group 985 IDU APO 757, New York, N. Y.	(1)
Dr. Y. L. Sandler Westinghouse Research Laboratories Schenectady, New York	(1)	Dr. E. M. Cohn NASA Code RPP 1512 H Street N. W. Washington 25, D. C.	(1)
Dr. Paul Delahay Department of Chemistry Louisiana State University Baton Rouge, Louisiana	(1)	Dr. E. Yeager Department of Chemistry Western Reserve University Cleveland 6, Ohio	(1)
Dr. W. J. Hamer Electrochemistry Section National Science Foundation Washington 25, D. C.	(1)	Lockheed Aircraft Corporation Missiles and Space Division Technical Information Center 3251 Hanover Street Palo Alto, California	(1)
Dr. Herbert Hunger Power Sources Division U. S. Army Signal Research & Development Laboratory Fort Monmouth, New Jersey			

**UNCLASSIFIED**

**UNCLASSIFIED**